

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/705,681 | FITZGIBBON | |
| | Examiner Erica E Cadugan | Art Unit 3722 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Erica E Cadugan. (3) _____

(2) Andrew Chu (4) _____

Date of Interview: various dates bet. 6/2/05 & 7/11/05

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All pending

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Pat 5413573 to Koivukangas

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Exr proposed the attached Exr. Amdt. Applicant's representative was unable to get a response from Applicant in the time req'd by the Exr.
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,

(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Fax Cover Sheet

Date: 6/2/05

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| To: <u>Andrew Chu</u> | From: Erica E Cadogan |
| Application/Control Number: <u>10/705,681</u> | Art Unit: 3722 |
| Fax No.: <u>(713) 223-4873</u> | Phone No.: (571) 272-4474 |
| Voice No.: <u>(713) 224-8080</u> | Return Fax No.: |
| Re: <u>dkf# 1111-21</u> | CC: |

Urgent For Review For Comment For Reply Per Your Request

Comments: proposed Examiner's Amendment

- Please let me know if there are
any questions.

Number of pages 5 including this page

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

This facsimile transmission is an Official U.S. Government document which may contain information which is privileged and confidential. It is intended only for use of the recipient named above. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying of this document is strictly prohibited. If this document is received in error, you are requested to immediately notify the sender at the above indicated telephone number and return the entire document in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

Proposed EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with *** on ***.

The application has been amended as follows:

Claim 1 (Currently amended). A tool holder arrangement comprising:

a tool holder to be mounted on a support and allowing removable attachment thereto of any one of a plurality of tools;

a sensor arrangement operable to sense at least one feature present on [a] one of said tools when attached to the tool holder, wherein [a] said feature or features are unique to the specific one of said tools; and

a processor operable to identify uniquely, from the sensed feature or features, a type of the tool attached to the tool holder,

wherein the tool holder and the sensor arrangement are such that a tool of the plurality of tools is electrically isolated from the support when the tool is attached to the tool holder;

wherein the sensor arrangement includes a plurality of rods, each having a longitudinal axis and being axially movable relative the support and the tool holder, extending to a face of the tool holder which is adjacent the tool when the tool is attached to the tool holder, there being a respective switch element actuatable in response to movement of each of the rods.

Claim 2 (Currently Amended). A tool holder arrangement according to Claim 1 wherein the sensor arrangement is operable to sense at least one feature present on a tool of the plurality of tools in the form of a projection on the tool.

Claim 3 has been canceled. (not shown)

Claim 4 has been canceled. (incorporated into claim 1)

Claim 5 (Currently Amended). A tool holder arrangement according to Claim [4] 1 wherein each rod is resiliently biased to an initial position by means of a spring.

Claim 6 (Currently Amended). A tool holder arrangement according to Claim [4] 1 wherein the rods are evenly angularly spaced about the circumference of a [notional] circle.

Claims 7-9 have been canceled. (not shown)

Claim 13 (Currently Amended). A tool holder according to Claim 1, further comprising at least one tool of said plurality of tools.

Claim 14 (Currently Amended). A tool holder according to Claim 13[wherein the sensor arrangement further comprises a plurality of axially moveable rods extending to a face of the tool holder which is adjacent to the tool when the tool is attached to the tool holder, there being a respective switch element actuatable in response to movement of each of the rods], wherein the tool is provided with two projecting elements positioned to be co-aligned with two of said rods.

Claims 15-16 have been canceled. (not shown)

Claim 17 (Currently Amended). A tool holder arrangement comprising:
a tool holder to be mounted on a support and allowing removable attachment thereto of any one of a plurality of tools;

a sensor arrangement operable to sense at two features present on [a] one of said tools when attached to the tool holder, the features being unique to a specific one of said tools; and

a processor operable to identify uniquely, from the sensed feature or features, a type of the tool attached to the tool holder,

wherein the tool holder and the sensor arrangement are such that the tool is electrically isolated from the support when the tool is attached to the tool holder;

wherein the sensor arrangement includes a plurality of rods, each having a longitudinal axis and being axially movable relative the support and the tool holder, extending to a face of the tool holder which is adjacent the tool when the tool is attached to the tool holder, there being a respective switch element actuatable in response to movement of each of the rods.

Claim 18 (Currently Amended). A robot comprising a tool holder arrangement according to Claim 1[comprising a robot].

2. The following changes to the drawings have been approved by the examiner and agreed upon by applicant: in Figure 1, the “8” that is at the left side of the figure has been changed to --18-- (in accordance with paragraphs 0033-0034 of the specification, for example). In order to avoid abandonment of the application, applicant must make these above agreed upon drawing changes.

NOTES: In the election filed May 23, 2005, Applicant indicated that claim 15 reads on the elected species of Figures 1-2. However, this does not appear to be accurate. Note that the shown embodiment shows the tool being provided with two projections (a la claim 2), rather than with two recesses as set forth in claim 15. Additionally, Examiner notes that claim 14 reads on the elected embodiment (in addition to the claims indicated by Applicant).

571-273-8300
July 15th

Also, note that U.S. Pat. No. 5,413,573 to Koivukangas (hereinafter ‘573) teaches a “tool holder arrangement wherein a “tool holder” 12 is mounted on a “support” 3, 20 and allows removable attachment of tools 4 thereto (see Figures 1-2, col. 3, lines 53-64, for example). ‘573 further teaches the use of a “sensor arrangement” 15, 16 operable to sense at least one feature unique to a specific tool and thus enable a “processor” 9 to identify the tool (col. 4, lines 19-46, for example). Additionally, note that the tool 4 is electrically isolated from the “support” 3, 20 because the member 12 is made of plastic such as Teflon or polyacetal (col. 3, lines 62-64, Figure 2). Also, note that the members 15, 16 of the sensor arrangement can either be recesses or projections (i.e., the members 15 can be either recesses or projections and so can the members 16, see col. 4, lines 59-62, for example, also Figure 2, for example). Note that the longitudinal direction of the projections 15 shown in Figure 2 extends generally in the left-right horizontal direction, and that such projections (whether the projections were 15 or whether they were 16) are considered “axially movable” in the direction of their longitudinal axis via movement of either the member 12 or the member 3, i.e., if elements 15 are in the form of projections as shown in Figure 2, they are “axially movable” relative to the tool holder 12 when they are moved when orientation arm or “support” 3 moves, and likewise, if elements 16 are in the form of projections as described in col. 4, lines 59-62, they are “axially moveable” relative to the “support” 3 when the “tool holder” 12 is so moved.

However, note that the projections or “rods” are not axially movable relative to both the support and the tool holder as now set forth in the independent claims.